SHRI SHANKARRAO NARAYANRAO DESHMUKH: Sir, a survey was made last year and an answer was given to me through a letter that a survey was made. Therefore, I would like to know from the hon. Minister who conducted this survey, who collected the data and is there any correspondence going on between the State of Maharashtra and the Government of India.

SHRI AJIT PANJA: As I said, the quesion of survey did not arise, and there is no survey done so far as the region mentioned by the Hon. Member is concerned.

SHRI SHANKARRAO NARAYANRAO DESHMUKH: I have received answer in reply to my letter addressed to the previous Minister for Information & Broadcasting that a survey was made and it was not feasible. Is this true or not?

SHRI AJIT PANJA: As I said, Sir, a survey of Maharashtra coverage was of course made but the question was of the particular hill, Ankai; at the time when this survey was made region-wise and the time when this survey was made is during the Sixth Plan. At that time the parameters were that towns with one lakh and more population would be covered. But here the population mentioned, is 51,432 of the place mentioned, i.e. Ankai region. Therefore, it was not brought in.

डा० बापू कालदाते : सभापति महोदय, मैं मंत्री महोदय से यह पूछना चाहता हूं कि जिस पत्र का आपने जिक्र किया है माननीय सदस्य ने, अब इस पत्र के बारे में आप जरा खोज कर सकेंगे क्या ? अगर खोज कर सकेंगे तो शायद उनके पत्र पर जवाब जो उनको मिला है, उसका आप ठीक से जवाब दे सकेंगे ।

Will you please try for that?

SHRI AJIT PANJA: If the letter is produced I will certainly look into it.

SHRI SHANKARRAO NARAYANRAO DESHMUKH: I will produce the letter, Sir.

Disparity in payment of bonus in the Corps of EME

*445. DR. H. P. SHARMA: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that some civilian staff in the Corps of EME are being deprived of the benefits of productivity-linked bonus in comparison to their counter-parts in the same department;

(b) if so, what are the reasons therefor;

(c) what is the number of such staff who have been adversely affected;

(d) whether it is also a fact that the affected employees have been representing against this dual policy since 1979 but Government have not taken any decision in the matter so far; and

(e) if so, what steps Government propose to take to remove the disparity?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENCE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (SHRI ARUN SINGH): (a) to (d) In the Corps of EME 18,406 civilian employees, fulfilling the criteria laid down by the Government, have been receiving payment of Productivity Linked Bonus since the inception of the Scheme. 548 civilian employees of this Corps, involved in production, are not covered by the scheme, as *inter-alia* the units in which they are deployed have a majority of combatant personnel. The aforesaid 548 civilian employees have been receiving ad-hoc bonus since 1982-83.

(e) The matter is under the consideration of the Government.

DR. H. P. SHARMA: Mr. Chairman, quite a few problems arise in institutions where combatants and civilians both are doing the same kind of work, because same emoluments are not given to both categories of workers. The reply admits that there are 548 employees which are not covered by productivity-linked bonus. May I know the reason why they are being given only ad hoc bonus and they are being differentiated from other employees?

SHRI ARUN SINGH: One of the conditions of productivity-linked bonus scheme, in so far as Defence is concerned, is that employees in the organisation should be predominantly civilian. As per this criterion, eight base workshops would only be covered under the scheme. There were other civilian employees in station workshop, vehicle dopot workshop, equipment depot workshop, and so on, who would have been left out. We found on a computation that the total number of civilian employees in such units exceeded the total number of combatant employees and, therefore, finally 78 EME units were covered under the scheme. There are now 11 units left where this criterion cannot apply because the number of combatants exceeds the number of non-combatants. Therefore, as per the basis of the scheme itself, 548 employees at the moment do not stand covered by the scheme.

DR. H. P. SHARMA: Who decides about this criterion and do both the sides agree to this criterion which the Minister has placed before the House? Second part of my question is, does the Government propose to constitute any kind of an agency which will go through all such institutions where civilians and combatants work and if there are any disparities, will it go through? Is there any overall agency which the Government propose to constitute?

SHRI ARUN SINGH: I am not clear about the Member referring to both sides in the matter...

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is, cobatants and civilians.

SHRI ARUN SINGH: There is no discussion between the combatants and non-combatants in the matter. This criterion was part of the original productivity-linked bonus scheme, which was introduced in 1979-80. As far as overall committee is concerned, I am happy to inform the hon. Member that there is an inter-Ministerial committee at the moment sitting and considering this matter because this affects a large number of employees in all kinds of Ministries, including ours, and there are representatives of our Ministry also. The committee is chaired by Joint Secretary (Personnel) in the Department of Expenditure and their report is awited. This matter is, in fact, before the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Next question.

Central Advisory Committee for Territorial Army

*446. SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Central Advisory Committee for the Territorial Army has been constituted; if so, when the last meeting was held, the frequency of its meetings and the proposed date for the next meeting; and

(b) if the answer to part (a) above be in the negative, what are the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENCE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (SHRI ARUN SINGH): (a) Yes, Sir. The last meeting of the Committee was held on 23rd March, 1984. The Committee have generally been meeting once in two years. The next meeting of the Committee will be held by the end of this year.

(b) Does not arise.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: In the answer, it has been said that the committee will meet generally once in two years and the last meeting was held March 1984 and the next meeting is proposed to be held by the end of the month. I would like to know, already two years and 9 months have passed. I do not know why there is this delay, inaction in having the meeting. If members are not interested in the meeting, I think they should either resign or they must have a new committee so that the committee must become active and there should be no delay and lethargy. I want to know what action is being taken and why this delay has taken place.